Defending Charlie Kirk

“If you strike me down, I shall become more powerful than you can possibly imagine.”

Apparently it wasn't enough that Charlie Kirk was assassinated.

Now they wish to assassinate his character and legacy as well.

Charlie Kirk "quotes" are being cherry-picked, butchered, taken out of context, and compiled into articles and videos attempting to make him look like a moral monster and preacher of hate.

Sadly, they couldn't even wait for the smoke to clear after he was gunned down in front of his family and a large crowd of supporters before they started in with the character attacks.

The purpose of this resource is to address these malicious "quotes." We'll show full context and explain Charlie's nuanced views as they relate to gay marriage, 2nd Amendment rights, empathy, DEI policies, and more.

It is exceedingly easy to disingenuously paint a negative picture of a person's character, regardless of who they are, via quotes pulled out of context.

As a "thought experiment," I cherry-picked a variety of Mother Teresa quotes and came up with a list that your typical leftist would find absolutely revolting—despite that Mother Teresa was widely considered one of the kindest and most loving women in history. (Yes, I'm aware of the Mother Teresa conspiracy theories—we'll save that for another time.)

One of the most *infamous* quotes taken out of context was a Trump quote, which suggested that Trump referred to Nazis and white supremacists as "very fine people" during a press conference. But within the context of the full speech, Trump explicitly stated that he's *not* referring to Nazis and white supremacists and that he *condemns* racism:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dfHYnFrUdCE

To this day there are leftists who still believe the "very fine people" lie. And that's exactly what it is—it is factually a lie. There is no possible way that Biden, Kamala, and Obama weren't aware of the full context when they repeated the lie during the 2024 presidential campaign.

Enough is enough. We need to expose this type of hate-fueled dishonesty immediately and head-on. So with that in mind, let's dig into things to determine the *true* meaning

and intent behind the Charlie Kirk “quotes” that have been making the rounds online, and that have sadly already amassed millions of views and reactions…

“He said that blacks have become more ‘murderous’ as they have been given more rights...”

This is a glaring and particularly disturbing example of how incredibly misleading it can be to pull a person’s words out of context.

Here is the full and original context of Charlie’s words about Black rights:

https://youtu.be/WV29R1M25n8?si=OPsMgcXAOWZlFAt3&t=5221

When we consider the Charlie Kirk “quote” *out* of context (per the headline above), the clear insinuation is that Charlie is a racist who believes that America was better off when Blacks had fewer rights. This is patently false. It’s an abhorrent lie. The truth, as can readily be seen in the video, is that Charlie said the exact opposite about Black rights. He said that it was “bad” and “evil” when blacks had fewer rights than whites. A true racist would never say such things.

Charlie’s interlocutor in the video was arguing that there is a high crime rate in the Black community today *because* Blacks were subjugated prior to the Civil Rights Acts of the 1960s. In response to this theory, Charlie simply made the point that there was actually *less* crime in the Black community when Blacks were subjugated. In other words, the data seems to indicate that the current high rate of crime in the Black community is not, in fact, the result of subjugation of Blacks prior to the 1960s.

In absolutely no way, shape, or form was Charlie Kirk arguing that America ought to revert back to when Blacks were oppressed. Again, he explicitly called Black subjugation “evil.”

Charlie’s theory was that violence in the Black community is largely due to broken and fatherless homes and was therefore simply pushing back on the theory about Black subjugation. When there is a problem, we can all agree that it’s good to determine the

root of the problem such that we can fix it.

This is what fifteen minutes of easy research will do, but I completely understand we're all busy and don't have time to dig up every quote pulled out of context—and that's precisely what people who are pushing a particular political narrative are counting on.

In the social media and information age, it can be difficult to blame people for forming strong opinions around headlines and sound bites because there is so much information out there. On the other hand, there is so much information out there. We can find the truth if we're genuinely seeking it.

Unfortunately, the political climate in America is so volatile right now that even when people are shown the truth, they'll willfully ignore it when it doesn't align with their politics. In all probability, this essay will be ignored by the people who simply wish to continue believing that Charlie was a bad person. They'll choose to believe the very people who perpetrated lies about Charlie's character—meaning the people who lied straight to their proverbial faces—instead of accepting the truth.

"There are those who hate the one who upholds justice in court and detest the one who tells the truth." - Amos 5:10

"He told Taylor Swift to submit to her husband. That she's not in charge. He also said that she's not a good role model for young women..."

Charlie held a traditional, Biblical worldview encompassing how he viewed family, marriage, the roles of husband and wife, etc.

Ephesians 5:21-25 discusses the roles of husband and wife in marriage:

"21 submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ.

22 Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord.

23 For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior.

24 Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands.

25 Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her."

There are many Bible-based sermons available on YouTube that cover these verses and this nuanced topic in much greater depth, but in short:

- Husbands are called to be providers and protectors for our wives. We're also called to *love* our wives *as much as Christ loved us*—meaning we ought to be willing to give our lives for our wives.

- Women are called to help and support their husbands. It's simply a different role in the relationship.

This isn't some crazy, unheard-of social structure. If a business had two CEOs it's not difficult to imagine the conflicts and dysfunction that would likely result—and very quickly. One CEO would ultimately *have* to submit to the other's role and decisions. God had this stuff figured out when he designed us. He knows what makes a healthy relationship. And if one doesn't believe that, no problem. I'm simply giving insight into Charlie's perspective—which was a loving one and not a hateful one. Again, Charlie would have been the first to say that we're called to love our wives dearly, and if it were to come to it, to give our lives for them. Wives are *not* called to give their lives for their husbands, nor are they called to be providers, nor are they called to be protectors, etc.

It's also critical to note that the Bible does not say, "Women, submit to men," or "Girlfriends, submit to your boyfriends." It says only that *wives* ought to submit to their *husbands*. Nobody is physically forcing women to get married, so it's not as if they "sign up for the Biblical role" without any choice in the matter. God gave us free will.

And guess who else has to submit? …Men! We must submit to the Lord. God is the "final boss." His Word is the "final arbiter" in respect to how we should treat one another in love and respect. By the transitive property, we're all submitting to God—husbands, wives, and children. It's a hierarchy.

All of this is everyday stuff to those of us familiar with God's Word:

"Have you not read that He who created them from the beginning made them male and female and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'?" - Matthew 19:4–5

Submission, in this context, is designed to bring peace and harmony to the home. It's designed to avoid quarrels. It is not designed to oppress or to insinuate that women are inferior. Women are God's miracle workers. Creating human life and bringing it into this world is miraculous. It's one of the most important things that any human being can do, and God gifted this miraculous ability to women alone…

Nothing better reveals how precious and how valuable women are to God than that the Savior of the world, Jesus, came into this world through a woman named Mary. It's the greatest true story in the history of the world...

Mary, did you know that your baby boy is the Lord of all creation?
Mary, did you know that your baby boy will one day rule the nations?
Did you know that your baby boy was heaven's perfect lamb?
And the sleeping child you're holding is the Great I Am!

("Mary Did You Know" by Songwriter Mark Lowry)

…This is what Charlie believed.

Charlie also talked about having bigger families and more kids on a pragmatic level because the U.S. birth rate has dropped below replacement rate. Survival of a country hinges largely on a healthy birth rate—and Charlie *loved* America. He wanted to see America, and all Americans, flourish.

The bottom line is that a Biblical view of family is the polar opposite of hateful. All we're talking about here at the end of the day is a young guy who holds a more traditional or "romanticized" view of gender roles. Ward Cleaver, the dad in the "Leave It To Beaver" sitcom of the 1950s, wasn't a hateful misogynist either, just for the record. ;) His wife, June, had supper ready for him every night when he came home from work. Ward was happy. June was happy. Wally and "the Beav" were happy. And viewers of the show were happy.

Charlie wasn't a fan of Taylor Swift's feminist leanings and left-wing politics because they were antithetical to his views, but he certainly didn't hate Taylor Swift, nor did he view women as second-class citizens in any way. Holding a more traditional view of gender roles does not equate to viewing women as second-class citizens. Again, it's all about differing *roles* that Charlie believed were healthy for families (the core), and in turn healthy for communities, and ultimately healthy for America as a whole.

A very strong argument could be made that modern views on family and relationships

are far inferior to traditional views. Look at all the cheating and promiscuity and broken families and single mothers and fatherless homes and divorce—etc., etc. This is really the underlying “argument” that Charlie was making via the traditional views he was passionate about.

“He said that if his daughter was raped at 10 years old, she would deliver the baby. He also said that abortion is worse than the Holocaust...”

Ben Shapiro recently posted a great segment covering precisely this topic. His views are nearly identical to Charlie’s (I’ve followed both Ben and Charlie for years), so what he says can be applied to what Charlie believed as well:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6yFFyM7niss

In brief, Charlie’s view was that unborn babies are human beings just like you and I, meaning that when you kill a baby, you are taking a life—and a completely innocent one. In the context of rape-related abortion, he viewed it as “two wrongs failing to make a right.”

But he’d also point out, as does Ben, that the appeal to rape-related abortion is a manipulative red herring, given that such abortions account for less than 1% of total abortions annually. When you ask a pro-choicer if they’d give up the 99% of all other abortions if pro-life advocates concede on the rape-related abortion issue, they’ll say no. Hence, the red herring. In other words, it’s not *actually* about rape-related abortions. Pro-choice activists want their abortions either way. And being that they want their abortions either way, it’s disingenuous to bring up the topic of rape.

There’s a deeper philosophical side to the pro-life position on rape-related abortion as well. It’s about being logically consistent in one’s position. If we hold that unborn babies are human beings with rights just like any one of us, we are directly violating that right if we concede to abortion in the case of rape. We’re saying that a random—and completely innocent—person needs to die because a person was raped. That being said, the appeal to a 10-year-old pregnant mother is a moral dilemma—that’s the whole point of it. On principle, if following one’s worldview to the letter, you do indeed have the baby. Spock from Star Trek would have that baby! “It’s the logical choice, captain.”

On the other hand, if confronted with this dilemma in the real world, one's response might be different and an exception might be made. There is the issue of higher risk associated with a person so young giving birth that would need to be weighed and discussed with a medical professional.

Regarding the Holocaust, Charlie was referring to the sheer number of babies being killed annually—usually merely for reasons of convenience to the mother. In the United States we kill 600,000 to 1,000,000 babies every year. Picture all of those bodies stacked up in a dirt grave in Germany. It's not remotely surprising that many pro-life advocates view abortion as genocide. The headline seems to insinuate that Charlie had something against Jews, but there is zero truth to that. He was friends with Ben Shapiro and many other Jewish people. Charlie believed that we are all created in the image of God.

"He said that some gun deaths are worth it to protect the 2nd Amendment, which he also calls a 'god-given right'..."

This, of course, is another quote taken out of context to paint a false impression. The insinuation is that Charlie had a heartless and callous view toward the victims and families of school shootings, and nothing could be further from the truth. It's an absurd and hateful contention.

Here is the full quote and a sufficient overview of Charlie's general views on the 2nd Amendment:

(The question was about his support for security guards in schools...)

CHARLIE KIRK:

"Yeah, it's a great question. Thank you. So I'm a big Second Amendment fan, but I think most politicians are cowards when it comes to defending why we have a Second Amendment. This is why I would not be a good politician, or maybe I would be, I don't know, because I actually speak my mind.

The Second Amendment is not about hunting. I love hunting. The Second Amendment is not even about personal defense. That is important. The Second Amendment is there, God forbid, so that you can defend yourself against a tyrannical government. And if that talk scares you—"Wow, that's radical, Charlie, I don't know about that"—well then, you have not really read any of the literature of our Founding Fathers. Number two, you've not read any 20th-century history. You're just living in Narnia. By the way, if you were actually living in Narnia, you would be wiser than wherever you're living now, because C.S. Lewis was really smart. So you don't know what alternative universe you're living in. You just don't want to face the reality that governments tend to get tyrannical and that if that happens, people need an ability to protect themselves and their families.

Now, we must also be real. We just have to be honest with the population. Having an armed citizenry comes with a price, and that is part of liberty. Driving comes with a price. 50,000 people die on the road every year. That's a price. You get rid of driving, and you have 50,000 fewer auto fatalities. But we have decided that the benefit of driving—speed, accessibility, mobility, having products, services—is worth the cost of 50,000 people dying on the road. So we need to be very clear that you're not going to get gun deaths to zero. It will not happen. You could significantly reduce them through having more fathers in the home and by having more armed guards in front of schools. We should have an honest and clear reductionist view of gun violence, but we should not have a utopian one.

You will never live in a society when you have an armed citizenry and you won't have a single gun death. That's nonsense. It's drivel. But I am, I—I think it's worth it. I think it's worth it to have a cost of, ***UNFORTUNATELY****, some gun deaths every year so that we can have the Second Amendment to protect our other God-given rights. That is a prudent deal. It's rational. Nobody talks like this. They live in a completely alternate universe.*

So then, how do you reduce death related to gun violence? People say, "Oh, Charlie, how do you stop school shootings?" How did we stop shootings at baseball games? Because we have armed guards outside of baseball games. That's why. How did we stop all the shootings at airports? How do we stop all the shootings at banks? We have armed guards outside of banks. Notice there are not a lot of mass shootings at gun shows where there are all these guns—because everyone's armed. If our money and our sporting events and our airplanes have armed guards, WHY DON'T OUR CHILDREN?"

Charlie's views are obviously synonymous with the U.S. Constitution. I thought the bad guys were the people who *don't* support the Constitution?

If we're going to call Charlie Kirk a preacher of hate because he was a strong supporter of the 2nd Amendment, then we'll have to call our founding fathers preachers of hate as well—because they obviously held the same views. We'll also have to call millions of Americans who support democracy in general preachers of hate, seeing that laws related to guns are decided democratically.

This is a great example of how it's not conservative voters that have changed their views. If anything, the overall views of conservatives have shifted further to the left. I still hold the same values that I was raised on. Suddenly, conservatives are "racist" because we support safe and secure borders and merit-based hiring, "bigots" for knowing that women don't have male genitals, and "extremists" because we support the 2nd Amendment…

The real preachers of hate are those labeling myself and others with these derogatory terms simply because we hold different political views.

In the United Kingdom, women and children aren't so much as allowed to carry pepper spray to protect themselves against sexual predators. I'll give you one guess as to which country has a *far* higher rate of sexual assault and rape between the United States and the United Kingdom.

Recently, I came across a commenter on social media who suggested that it's a mockery to the victims of school shootings to suggest that "guns do not kill people." What an incredibly odd contention! It's factually true that we do not put guns on trial for murder. If the problem in America were guns, why is it that there was an average of only 2 school shootings per year in the 1950s and '60s compared to an average of 300 per year in the 2020s? That's an increase of roughly 15,000%. Furthermore, it was far more common for kids and teens to own and use guns back then.

So what changed? Did guns hold a board meeting where they decided to become more violent?

This is quite obviously the point being made via the "guns don't kill people" slogan. It has absolutely nothing to do with mocking the tragic deaths of schoolchildren, and to suggest otherwise is ridiculous.

…What else has changed since the 1950s?...

God was taken out of our schools. Today's kids are being taught that they are nothing more than accidents of nature—reconfigured "sacks of stardust." Kids and teens are increasingly isolated. There are more divorces, broken families, and fatherless homes. Digital/sexual content is pervasive. Traditional family is frowned upon. There are fewer community support structures (less church, fewer Boy Scouts, etc.)—and the list goes on.

…And where does all of this lead, according to the science?

It leads to **mental illness.**

Estimates are that a whopping *twenty percent* of today's kids and teens have a mental illness. That's 1 in 5 kids!

…And leftists blame guns?!

Charlie Kirk's vision was to turn American youth around—back in the direction of the way things were. He had a heart for the youth, and his organization, TurningPoint USA, was focused largely on youth outreach.

In the meantime, Charlie proposed that we have armed security guards at our schools as a matter of routine. This isn't a perfect solution—there is no perfect solution—but it's a reasonable one. It would allow us to preserve the right to defend ourselves and our families while also protecting our children.

"In response to affirmative action, Charlie Kirk said that when he sees a Black pilot, he'll wonder if he's qualified..."

Charlie made it clear that he'd have never questioned whether a person of a certain skin color is sufficiently qualified for a job prior to DEI and affirmative action policies. We could stop right here, but allow me to explain what Charlie was alluding to in more detail…

Charlie was an outspoken advocate of merit-based hiring policies, and justifiably so. Who in their right mind would elect to be operated on by a surgeon who gained a position in part because of his skin color—of all things—vs. his skill? We're quite literally

talking about hiring people based on the amount of melanin in their skin. Have we lost our minds?

……
*VICTORY—United Airlines Agrees to Abandon Illegal Employment Discrimination Following Federal Civil Rights Complaint Filed by **America First Legal***
……

What's actually racist—and also illegal—is for an employer to hire a Black man over a more highly skilled White man because of the Black man's skin color. And it would, of course, be equally wrong to hire a White man over a more skilled Black man because of the White man's skin color. Can you even imagine the screeching we'd hear coming from the left if they were ever to catch wind of the latter scenario happening? But apparently it's all fun and games when it's DEI racism perpetrated against Whites.

So yes, of course Charlie Kirk was against this sort of thing—as anyone with an IQ over 65 ought to be.

Quite obviously, when Charlie says that DEI leaves him little choice but to wonder whether a Black pilot is sufficiently qualified to fly the plane he's boarding, he's using a rhetorical device to elucidate the absurdity—and even potential danger—of DEI hiring practices. He's making a perfectly valid point that has everything to do with questions of skill and competence and absolutely nothing to do with racism.

When corporations with DEI programs are literally *telling us* they're hiring based on race and race-based quotas, we *all* ought to be asking the same types of questions that Charlie asked:

"Was this pilot hired predominantly for their skill and ability to fly a plane? Or, were they potentially rushed through the system and hired to meet some woke corporation's DEI requirements?!"

Charlie would be the first to tell anyone that if the roles were reversed and it were Whites being hired for their skin color, he'd wonder if the White pilot was qualified to fly the plane. But that's simply not what has been happening with anti-White DEI programs.

The bottom line—the most important takeaway—is that the reason Charlie Kirk and millions of others oppose DEI hiring practices has nothing to do with racism. The justifiable concern was and is whether we are hiring the best people for any given job.

When folks are being hired for reasons that quite literally have nothing to do with the skill and experience required to do a given job well, it's common sense to question things. It's common sense to question our sanity, in fact.

The entire issue boils down to a single question: If your child were in need of life-saving heart surgery and you could choose between a surgeon hired because of their skin color or a surgeon hired purely based on skill, experience, and competence, what would your choice be? We all know the answer.

We want society to function as well as it can. We do not want to settle for mediocre or even second best. Meritocracy pushes us toward the best. DEI hiring practices clearly do not.

What would be racist is the view that Black people *in general* are not skilled enough to be pilots, doctors, etc. Literally *nobody* is making that argument at all.

As somewhat of an aside, here is a bulletproof argument against DEI and affirmative action that you may wish to reference when debating leftists on this issue:

…….

P1. If DEI and affirmative action are racist, then we ought to reject them on moral grounds.

P2. DEI is inherently racist.

Support for P2: In the U.S., it is illegal to hire people based on skin color, and it's illegal *because* it's considered racial discrimination. Discrimination against race is literally the definition of racism.

C3. Therefore, we ought to reject DEI and affirmative action on moral grounds.

…….

Finally, here's a direct quote from Charlie that explicitly refutes the insinuation that he believed Blacks could not be qualified pilots:

"Of course I believe anybody of any skin color can become a qualified pilot."
- Charlie Kirk

“He was against the Civil Rights Acts of the 1960s”...

The critical distinction here is that Charlie was not against “civil rights.” Rather, what he opposed was some of the broad language in the Civil Rights Acts that he believed have been politically weaponized and used to justify woke DEI and affirmative action policies.

Charlie absolutely believed that Blacks and minorities should have equal rights, period.

“He endorsed the attack against Paul Pelosi”...

Once again, this is patently false. Charlie explicitly stated that the attack was “awful” and “not right.”

Here are his remarks in full context:

“I’m not qualifying it. I think it’s awful. It’s not right,” Kirk said about the attack on Pelosi, who suffered a skull fracture after being hit in the head with a hammer. “But why is it that in Chicago you’re able to commit murder and be out the next day? Why is it that you’re able to trespass, commit second-degree murder, commit arson, threaten a public official, and get cashless bail? This happens all over San Francisco. But if you go after the Pelosis, oh, you’re [not] let out immediately. Got it.”

Obviously, Charlie questioned why Pelosi’s attacker was sitting in jail when it’s the case that soft-on-crime Democrats have been allowing murderers to walk out on bail—and it’s a perfectly fair challenge. If they’re going to let murderers out then it follows that they ought to have let Pelosi’s attacker out by precisely the same standard.

Charlie condemned the attack but also exposed the double standard. He identified *two* wrongs resulting from the same situation, in other words. Charlie did not support lenient bail policies. If it were not the case that leftists have allowed other violent criminals out

on bail, he'd have never raised the issue as it pertained to Pelosi's attacker. Again, he was analyzing the situation and exposing hypocrisy.

"He used racial slurs against an Asian person in the crowd..."

Fact check: FALSE.

The claim is that Charlie called an Asian person in his audience a "chink," which is a racial slur against Asians.

In reality, Charlie was addressing "Cenk Uygur" of The Young Turks.

Cenk Uygur.

"Cenk" is pronounced "jenk."

The people spreading these accusations have reached a level of ignorance and dishonesty that was previously thought to be scientifically impossible. Their brains need to one day be donated to science and studied to determine where humanity lost its way.

He said that trans people are wearing the gender equivalent of "blackface"...

Charlie was making a simple analogy. Let's look at the facts:

"Blackface" was used by theater actors to portray Black people. E.g., a white person would apply black makeup over his or her face to play a Black character.

When a biological male wears feminine make-up and clothing, the intent is to portray himself as a biological female—as something that he is not.

Charlie saw this as being offensive to women, just as blackface is widely held as being offensive to blacks. He had every right to this view.

Charlie agreed with the science and, as such, naturally held that a man cannot become a woman any more than a white person can become a Black person by throwing on some make-up. Here is what the science says:

– "Sex = gamete role (sperm vs. egg).
In biology, "male" and "female" are most commonly defined by the type of gamete an organism is organized to produce: males make small gametes (sperm), and females large gametes (eggs). Medical/scholarly sources and reviews use this definition because it works across species. philsci-archive.pitt.edu+1

– Human sex differentiation starts early and is developmental, not elective.
*Chromosomal signals (typically XX or XY) drive embryonic sex development via genes like **SRY**, leading gonads and reproductive anatomy down male- or female-typical pathways. This is a coordinated developmental program, not something adults can reverse. NCBI+1*

– Medical transition changes phenotype, not chromosomes or gamete type.
*Hormones and surgeries can change secondary sex traits (voice, hair, chest, and genital morphology) and many aspects of outward appearance. But they do **not** change a person's karyotype (e.g., XX/XY) or reprogram the body to produce the other type of gamete. After certain treatments (e.g., gonadectomy, long-term hormones), fertility can be reduced or lost, which is why guidelines emphasize counseling about fertility preservation. Journal of Ethics + 3PubMed+3UW Departments+3*

– Intersex conditions show biology is complex—but don't negate the gamete definition.
Differences of sex development (DSDs) demonstrate exceptions (e.g., SRY variants, gonadal dysgenesis), yet even in these cases the biological discussion still centers on the developmental pathway toward sperm or egg production."

Gender ideology asserts that men can become women, that men can get pregnant, that some women have male genitalia, etc. It is therefore an affront to everything we know to be true. It is an *attack* on everything we know to be true.

"Trans women" are not women. They are biological males, or in other words, men. White people in blackface are not Black. They are whites. Again, this is the comparison being drawn—and it is factually correct.

The term "woman" refers to an adult biological female, and the term "man" refers to an adult human male. That is what these terms mean, and any rational individual must reject any other definition on the basis that no other definition is coherent.

If and when one tries to define “woman” any other way, it loses all meaning. If “woman” can refer to a biological male just as readily as a biological female, then we have no clue what anyone is talking about when they use the term.

Obviously, we cannot communicate when we don’t know what words mean. If I were to insist that the term “tree” also refers to what we’ve always known to be a “flower,” then you’d have no clue what I’m talking about when I use the term “tree.” … This isn’t complicated, and it’s not bigotry. It’s common sense. It’s how we use language.

Charlie had a heart for the LGBTQ community. He loved gay and trans people. This doesn’t mean he agreed with gender ideology. One can love a person without agreeing with their views, actions, and/or behaviors. We are all sinners. If you take nothing else away from this essay, remember this:

If it were not possible to love people despite their sin, then it would be impossible to love *anyone*.

The burden of proof is on anyone claiming that it is somehow “hateful” or “bigoted” to define the terms “man” and “woman” as they are defined above.

When we boil it down, a major part of the “trans debate” is not about people. It’s about *language.*

“He said that BLM stands for Burn, Loot and Murder.”

My son-in-law is Black. He’s a good man and I’m proud to have him as part of the family – of course! If I thought Charlie Kirk was a racist I would be no fan of his.

It is factually the case that BLM burned, looted, and murdered during the Floyd riots. I used to believe they were a well-intentioned organization and actually donated to the cause. But that was before I’d done my research and discovered what they really stand for.

Candace Owens (who happens to be Black, and was one of Charlie Kirk's best friends) views BLM as a “domestic terrorist group.” She has talked extensively about this and about how she feels BLM has harmed and taken advantage of the Black community:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oj3duS5PI3I

Is Candace a racist too, or is “racism” only where white people object to the motives of BLM?

Clearly, people with less melanin in their skin can object to a movement whose core principles don’t align with theirs. Doing so has absolutely nothing to do with skin color. I could care less if a person has more melanin in their skin than another person. I can only encourage those who assume that BLM is a benevolent organization to do their own research. If we end up disagreeing when all is said and done, that’s fine! It changes nothing. There is still no racism entailed in having an opinion about an organization based on the organization’s views. One of the things that raised red flags for me (in addition to the violence) is that the founders of BLM are avowed Marxists. They say so on video. This fact alone means that they hold values that are antithetical to traditional American values. Similarly, the beliefs they espouse regarding family structure sound like something out of a communist manifesto. Family is the backbone of a society. If you get that wrong, society is in trouble.

Charlie Kirk's TurningPoint USA organization does a lot of work with Black speakers and with the Black community in general. Again, Charlie had a heart for the Black community.

Racism is the L.A. Times calling Larry Elder the "black face of white supremacy." Racism is when a leftist labels a Black person an "Uncle Tom" because they have conservative views. Racism is when you reject the scholarship application of an Asian student because they are not Black. Racism is well-documented antisemitism perpetrated by leftist college students across the country. Racism is the many derogatory things Joy Reid has said about “white people” on national TV. Racism is when the media reports the color of a crime suspect when it's a white person but not when it's a Black person. (Etc., etc.)

Obviously racism exists, but it exists on both sides. And it’s absolutely being fueled by left-wing media to create a divide. I could cite a hundred examples. And it’s working. I was called a racist solely because of a Facebook post where I shared that I support a safe and secure border coupled with *legal* immigration. Gee golly, Beaver, where are people getting the idea that it’s now—suddenly—racist to support safe and secure

borders?

“He said that a woman being a partner at a law firm isn't a big deal, but having three kids is a really big deal...”

This again refers to Charlie Kirk's Biblical view of marriage, family, and the roles of husband, wife, father, and mother. It's a reflection of the tremendous value that Charlie Kirk placed on motherhood.

We've all heard it said that being a mom is one of the most important jobs in the world. When Charlie said this, he meant it!

Perhaps we should ask kids about this one. What would *they* value most—a mom who works in a law office while they're stuck in daycare, or a stay-at-home mom? I'm very grateful I had a stay-at-home mom, and wouldn’t have wanted it any other way.

Are we really ready to say that men in the ‘50s didn’t love or respect their wives? Did Ward Cleaver not love and respect June?

Charlie’s view on this issue was in no way intended as an attack on working women! Rather, think of it like a “sales pitch” or “marketing campaign” for the traditional family that Charlie believed to be the gold standard. Statistics appear to indicate that women were much happier back in the day.

Nowadays it’s quite obviously the case that many women, wives, and moms don’t have the luxury to choose not to work. Absolutely nobody faults them. Quite the opposite. We feel sorry for young families who can’t afford homes at today’s outrageous prices. It’s safe to say that an all-knowing God understands the current economy. Charlie also understood. He’s not pointing fingers at women who have to work. But at the same time, there’s nothing wrong with advocating for what he saw as the “family ideal.” If a person believes that traditional family is what makes people happier and increases their well-being, then is it not a good thing to “campaign” for that conviction? Charlie loved women in a godly way. He wanted to see them at their happiest and most fulfilled.

If for some irrational reason you see Charlie a preacher of hate because of his views on the role of women, wives, and mothers, then you must also call Mother Teresa a preacher of hate. She and Charlie held nearly identical views on the subject:

“A woman is created to be a mother, to be a heart, to love, to give life. That is her role.” -Mother Teresa

As mentioned earlier, Mother Teresa won a Nobel Peace Prize and was widely regarded as one of the kindest and most loving women in history.

By contrast, Charlie Kirk was murdered in broad daylight, and leftists celebrated.

“He said that ‘empathy’ is a made-up New Age term that does a lot of damage...”

Charlie was referring to Bill Clinton's use of "empathy" as a political tool to manipulate people.

"Bill Clinton was famously called the 'Empathizer-in-Chief' because he used empathy very deliberately as a political tool—especially during the 1990s."

Charlie was no intellectual slouch. Quite the opposite. He knew exactly what he was saying. He explained that he preferred the term *"sympathy"* over empathy. Empathy suggests that you can essentially become the other person—that you can walk in their shoes for a day. But that’s simply not true. We can have sympathy for people, but we will never walk a day in their shoes even when we’ve shared similar experiences. My wife and I have been to Disneyworld, meaning the same place at the same time. But she had a different vacation experience than me because she’s a different person. Perhaps she was feeling under the weather, or didn’t get enough sleep, or got sunburned. We are all unique individuals with our own unique experiences.

We will never truly feel what it’s like to be Erika Kirk, the wife of Charlie Kirk, as she is dealing with the tragic loss of her husband and father to their two beautiful children. We can only sympathize as best we’re able.

“He said that Black women do not have the brain processing power to be taken

seriously”...

Fact check: FALSE.

Ty Smith of the Modern Renaissance Man The YouTube channel did an excellent job of covering this accusation HERE:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M4otj0Rcmmw

If indeed Charlie Kirk had said that Black people *in general* are low IQ, we could reasonably call that a racist view. But that is absolutely not what Charlie said, nor was that Charlie’s view of Black people.

As mentioned earlier, Charlie maintained close friendships with many Black individuals, including Candace Owens. Here is Candace discussing her relationship with Charlie:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_dRaEO47-co

Candace went on a long TurningPoint USA tour together with Charlie Kirk and heard him share his views on Blacks and the Black community over, and over, and over again. Few people were more familiar with Charlie’s views than her. What makes a random leftist on social media think that they *know* Charlie after watching a handful of TikTok videos purposely edited to paint him in the worst light possible? That’s absurd.

When Charlie discussed that DEI and affirmative action policies are placing Black people in roles and positions that “white people would have held,” this is factually the case. It’s literally the stated objective of DEI. When woke corporations set a quota to hire “x” number of Blacks, they are replacing whites and sometimes Asians that would have otherwise filled those positions. Again, that is the stated mission. Hence, in absolutely no way, shape, or form is it racist to state the facts in this regard.

As we discussed earlier, Charlie did not agree with DEI and affirmative action on principle. He was a proponent of merit-based and performance-driven hiring.

As for the insulting tone of Charlie’s remarks in this instance, we've all made unfriendly remarks toward others, so "let he who hasn't sinned cast the first stone." Ironically, it’s an insult to imply that Charlie Kirk was an awful person, so already we’ve identified millions of people who aren’t in a position to judge…

What's noteworthy is not the insult but that it's one of so very few that a million leftists could dig up out of countless thousands of hours of Charlie Kirk's readily available content. Therefore, what this "quote" inadvertently shows is that insults were *uncharacteristic* of Charlie. Let's add up the insults—not to mention open threats of violence—made by countless left-wing activists on TikTok and see how they're doing. It wouldn't be pretty.

If Charlie Kirk is a hater for one insult or even fifty insults, then we are all haters by the same metric.

"He said that Democratic women want to die alone without children"...

Here again, no hate found.

Charlie was simply speculating on the implications of the polling data referenced in this video:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RcTxG1_9FRw

He was making a perfectly valid inference. The data indicates that getting married and having kids is near the bottom of the list of priorities for leftist women—hence the title of the video:

"Why do Democrat women want to die alone?"

Again, think of Charlie Kirk as a "marketer" of the traditional family—not to make money, but because he had a love for people and for family. He was very passionate, and his heart was absolutely in the right place.

"He said it's time to stop listening to rap music and this degenerate hip-hop stuff and go back to the music that built our civilization..."

It's simply a fact that many rap lyrics are very dark. Black-on-Black violence is promoted. Interracial violence is promoted. Violence against the police is promoted. Political violence is promoted. Abuse against women is promoted, etc. If you're somebody like Charlie Kirk who was raised in a Christian home, listening to "WAP" is likely to be a shock to your system and a shock to your moral conscience. It's not hard to understand why anyone walking in faith would have a negative view of such things. It's very antithetical to the Biblical worldview. That's not to say that all rap lyrics are bad—of course not. But there are very strong "recurrent themes" in many of the lyrics, and people emulate that kind of thing. It can wear down your conscience until you're generally numb to things that aren't good for the soul.

The biggest concern for Charlie was the amount of melanin in the skin of the rappers, or in other words, their skin color. …I'm kidding, of course. Do you see how ridiculous that sounds? Charlie's concern had absolutely nothing to do with any sort of prejudice against Blacks, because he wasn't a racist. I seem to recall hearing concerns about rap culture from other people as well. Hmm. Who was it? Oh yeah. *Black people.* Brandom Tatum (who is another excellent advocate for conservative values) talks about the dangers of rap culture, and argues that rap is literally killing Black youth:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D0WrTZ8HPgQ

Charlie Kirk's views on rap and rap culture are very similar to those of Brandon Tatum, Candace Owens, etc. There's nothing wrong with speaking the truth in love. Again, Charlie had a heart for the Black community and worked hard at organizing outreach programs for Blacks. Ironically, this is one of the reasons there are so many sound bites of Charlie Kirk talking about things relevant and related to the Black community. It's not because he was a hater; it's literally the opposite. He was not shy about citing crime statistics, statistics about fatherless homes, etc. To solve a problem, you first have to acknowledge that it exists. You have to raise awareness. Charlie Kirk had zero problem engaging in sensitive issues. He wasn't afraid of being falsely branded a racist because he knew his own heart. And God knew his heart.

"He said that heterosexual marriage should be a prerequisite to adoption"...

Charlie’s view on adoption once again follows directly from his Biblical worldview.

Firstly, Charlie explicitly said that he has a heart—meaning a love—for the LGBTQ community. It’s on video for all to see. Again, he viewed all people and all races as God's children. Nobody was "less than," to Charlie. But this doesn't mean that anything goes. He believed that marriage was between a man and a woman, per his Christian worldview. People need to understand that love does not equal approval. (Any parent understands this!)

To demonstrate that Charlie was some sort of "hater,” one would have to demonstrate that his Biblical worldview was insincere and ill-intentioned. For all who hold that God designed and created man and woman with a special and specific purpose in mind, it's not difficult to understand Charlie’s position on adoption. The Bible makes it very clear:

"Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh." -Genesis 2:24

Consider this: If it is true that God has a divine *plan* for mankind, then it logically follows that some actions will comport with that plan, whereas other actions will fall outside the bounds of that plan. The latter actions are what we call “sin.”

To suggest that a “second dad” can offer the same level of nurturing and care as a mom is to argue that women and mothers bring zero special benefits to the table with respect to raising a child. Charlie didn't believe this to be true. Many of us have a special bond with our mothers that we don’t have with our fathers, and vice versa! Doesn’t *every* child deserve this “gold standard”? I think we all know intuitively that having a male and female role model in the home is a very good thing, and I don't think it's even controversial—meaning Charlie Kirk's views are equally noncontroversial.

God knows and wants what’s best for us because He is a loving God. Christianity is all about love:

"You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." - Jesus

…What Jesus was saying here is the coolest thing ever! He’s telling us that when we love others, *we're also loving God.* You are God's creation and made in God's image. Clearly, love is paramount to God. Jesus is saying that loving God and loving others are the two most important things we can possibly do in life.

...This is precisely what Charlie Kirk believed…

Charlie aggressively defended gays in the conservative movement *despite* that he believed same-sex relationships are not within God's plan for us. Listen carefully to what Charlie had to say in this video:

https://www.facebook.com/reel/1973827670069634

No "homophobe" or "bigot" says anything like this—period.

David Ruben, a prominent gay conservative, was great friends with Charlie and spoke of what a great man he was.

This is why so many people are so passionate about **defending Charlie Kirk.**

We know for a fact that he had an amazing heart.

Charlie was an incredible example of how we can love others while staying true to our convictions.

Searching for hate: 0 results found.

Searching for love: "Seek *me with all your heart, and you will find me!" -Jesus*